

Remarks

The Applicant agrees that the Japanese copies of priority documents are erroneous and belong to another application. Nonetheless, the Applicant respectfully submits that a proper claim of priority has been made with respect to FR00/03322, filed March 15, 2000. The Applicant will submit a certified copy of the French priority document in due course.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's helpful suggestion with respect to a new title. That suggested title has been adopted.

The Applicant has made several changes to the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Also, appropriate revisions to Claims 23 and 24 have been made so that they are now in conformance with the changes made to the specification. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges the rejection of Claims 22, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112. All three claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. In that regard, Claim 26 has now been amended into independent form. Claim 22 has been cancelled. The Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 23 and 26 are now in compliance with §112. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges the rejection of Claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by US '192. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is now moot as it applies to Claim 22 in view of its cancellation. The Applicant nonetheless respectfully submits that the remaining claims are fully patentable over US '192 for the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 15 recites, among other things, that the memory in which is loaded a program implementing the Internet protocols is the memory of a Digital Signal Processor. The

Applicant respectfully submits that US '192 fails to disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, that the program implementing the Internet protocols is loaded in the memory of a DSP. In particular, the SMTP, FTP and HTTP routines of Fig. 2 of US '192 are stored in the Network interface chip 36. This is not a DSP as specifically recited in Claim 15. As noted in US '192 at column 6, lines 14-21, the device control circuitry 38, which may include a DSP according to line 21, has "little or no networking capability."

Also, in Fig. 12 of US '192, a UART (Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter) is used to connect chip 36 to a modem. Thus, chip 36 cannot be considered to be a modem chip inasmuch as it does not comprise modem functionalities. US '192 teaches that the chip cannot be considered as a DSP in which is loaded a program for exchange of data on the network since it is clearly not a DSP and it does not comprise a program for exchange of data on a network.

The DSP as recited in Claim 15 is sharply contrasted to US '192 since it comprises a memory in which is loaded Internet protocols and a signal processing program for exchange of data on a network. US '192 does not explicitly or implicitly disclose a DSP comprising such programs. The DSP of US '192 disclosed in column 6, line 21 is in the device control circuitry 38 and does not comprise a memory in which is loaded Internet protocols. The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that US '192 is inapplicable to Claims 15-21 and 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges the rejection of Claims 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over US '192. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection as it applies to Claim 22 is moot in view of the cancellation of Claim 22. The Applicant also respectfully submits that Claims 15-21 and 23-28 are patentable over US '192 for the reasons set forth below.

As noted above, the Applicant's Claim 15 recites, among other things, that the memory in which is loaded a program implementing Internet protocols is the memory of a DSP. The Applicant respectfully submits that there is utterly no teaching or suggestion for one skilled in the art to modify US '192 and integrate the whole of the circuitry of Fig. 1b and the network interface functionalities into the memory of a DSP as recited in Claim 15.

This is evidenced by the fact, as noted by the Applicant in the Applicant's Specification, that in paragraph [0004], those skilled in the art knew at the time of the invention that the memory of a DSP was not sufficient to load Internet functionalities. Thus, with those teachings known in the art as background, there is no suggestion to modify the US '192 structure and incorporate the programs of two separate components into a single DSP. Also, this would have led one of ordinary skill in the art away from such an incorporation because of memory size problems.

The rejection relies on the notion that the integration of the circuitries of Fig. 1b of US '192 into a single monolithic chip was to reduce chip count, pin I/O and size. However, the Applicant notes that in view of US '192 there is no teaching or suggestion to reduce chip count, pin I/O and/or size. In fact, US '192 teaches a single web interfacing chip and, accordingly, nothing in US '192 teaches or suggests that the data processing functionalities can be integrated into such a chip.

Instead, US '192 only teaches a first chip comprising the Internet functionalities and a second chip which can comprise a DSP. In column 6 at lines 14 and 15, US '192 teaches that "the device control circuitry 38 implements the main functionality of the device 34, that typically has little or no network capability." Thus, this teaching is the opposite of the subject matter recited in Claims 15-21 and 23-28 which recites the incorporation of Internet functionalities into a DSP. The Applicant notes that there is no greater evidence of non-obviousness than when the prior art "teaches away" from the

claimed subject matter. That is exactly the case here wherein US '192 at column 6, lines 14 and 15 teaches away from the subject matter of the solicited claims. As a consequence, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are non-obvious over US '192. Withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750

TDC:mnr
(215) 656-3381